DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 740 TM 014 074

AUTHOR Thompson, Linda W.
TITLE An Evaluation Approach: Programs for At-Risk Students.
INSTITUTION Indiana Public School/Univ. Partnership.
PUB DATE Oct 89
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Failure; Compensatory Education; Educational Assessment; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Formative Evaluation; *High Risk Students; Potential Dropouts; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Programs; *State Programs; Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Opportunity Prog At Risk Students; *Indiana

ABSTRACT

The Educational Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students is a statewide initiative of the State of Indiana to expand existing programs or create new programs for at-risk students. The 57 programs improved or initiated in the 1988-89 school year most commonly included tutoring, counseling and support services, or promotion of parent/community involvement. The evaluation process to be applied to these programs is described. A preliminary step in the evaluation process is the identification and involvement of a group of people who will use the results of the evaluation and, therefore, will be able to suggest questions which should be addressed. Subsequent steps include the following: (1) determining the needs the program is designed to address; (2) clarifying the specific goals of the program; (3) considering how to examine the program fairly; (4) identifying the results of the program; (5) interpreting the data; and (6) deciding what recommendations and reports can be made. Appendix A lists the strategies of formative and summative evaluations. Appendix B is a sample evaluation report for the Indiana State Department of Education. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LINDA W. THOMPSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED318740

AN EVALUATION APPROACH:

PROGRAMS FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Indiana Public School/University Partnership

January, 1990

TM 014074

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation approach for at-risk students is the product of research and input from a number of Indiana educators. The contributions of the following people are gratefully acknowledged:

For compiling and writing the document:

Linda W. Thompson
Research Assistant
Indiana Public School/University Partnership

For serving as members of the IPS/UP At-Risk Program Evaluation Focus Group, providing ideas, follow-up information, review, and feedback used in the production of this document:

Walter Aldorisio
Center Grove School Corporation

Darla Cohen
Center for School Assessment,
Indiana Department of Education

Richard D. Frisbie
Indianapolis Public Schools

Marguerite Hart
MSD Washington Township School Corporation

Dennis Jackson
Director, Educational Opportunities for At-Risk Students
Indiana Department of Education

Ed Robbins
Executive Director,
Indiana Public School/University Partnership

Myrtle Scott
Indiana University

Marcella Taylor
Senior Officer,
Center for Community Relations and Special Populations
Indiana Department of Education

AN EVALUATION APPROACH:
PROGRAMS FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

Programs for At-Risk Students in Indiana

"Educational Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students" is a statewide initiative initially funded by the Indiana State Legislature for the 1988-89 school year with continuation funding through the 1990-91 school year assured. In the first year all Indiana school corporations received funds from the $20 million appropriation to expand existing programs or create new programs in any of nine specified areas. Each year, each local school corporation is required to submit an evaluation report on its at-risk programs to the Indiana Department of Education. The department, in turn, prepares an evaluation report for the State Legislature. While a compliance report to funding agencies is one aspect of evaluation, school districts and the Department alike are interested in more than compliance; they want to know what has occurred, what worked, and what refinements are suggested for these projects.

Indiana Public Schools/University Partnership (IPS/UP) corporations share the state's interest in examining and refining the effectiveness of these programs for at-risk students. Services for at-risk students has been an interest of the IPS/UP since its inception in 1986. During the 1988-89 school year the partnership school corporations established and expanded a total of 57 programs for at-risk students under the legislative initiative. Most commonly, these projects included tutoring, counseling/support services, or parent/community involvement.

Evaluation of Educational Programs

Evaluation by definition is a determination of the value of something -- in this case, an educational project. A well-formed evaluation is based on <u>facts</u> -- those things which we can presume to know objectively -- and <u>judgments</u> -- opinions reached after consideration of information. Ideally, a well-planned evaluation will be both feasible and practical, obtaining this information in an efficient manner.

The purpose of the evaluation process described here is not "cause and effect" or "acceptable/not acceptable" verdicts. Rather it is to provide careful and accurate descriptions and comments to support sound decision-making. Ideally, evaluation is an on-going process, using appropriate methodology and producing information which is both valid and reliable. An outcome of a useful evaluation will be a fair presentation of a project's strengths and weaknesses which will enable decision-makers to build on those strengths and address any problems.

Evaluation of Programs for At-Risk Students

While these ideas describe educational evaluation in general, there are additional considerations pertinent to evaluation of Indiana at-risk programs. These factors include the following.

An Holistic Approach: While the Educational Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students is categorically-funded, at-risk students and programs are part of the total school. Viewing at-risk programs as part of this larger context will give a more complete picture of the students' needs and the program's impact. At-risk evaluation should consider this program within its own parameters (e.g., students, staff and activities) as well as in the trends and services of the district at-large.

The Longitudinal Picture: The issues which generated the need for at-risk programs are unlikely to be resolved quickly. It is more likely that the impact of at-risk services will evolve over time rather than within a single school year calendar. By gathering data which not only looks at the impact within a single year but also helps draw a long term picture of what is happening with at-risk students, educators can make a fuller statement about a program and its effects.

This longitudinal picture often focuses on impact over time in areas of general school adjustment and achievement. In programs which are funded on an biennial basis, this picture may be measured for the two years of funding; for programs with continuing funding, the picture may be more long term across several years. Most frequently, this measurement involves existing data, such as districtwide test scores, grades, attendance, and students' progress toward graduation.

Generalizable vs. Context Specific Information: The Educational Opportunity Program for At-Risk Students was designed to give school corporations broad latitude in designing programs to address specific local needs. This has resulted in a wide variety of at-risk programs in the state and, in some cases, within a corporation. This diversity provides the opportunity to examine what works and what does not work with at-risk students in a variety of contexts.

A good evaluation process must consider whether data are indicative of a successful intervention program in any setting or related to specific factors within this program's context.

1. Are there factors which would contribute to the success/nonsuccess of any similar program?
2. Are there factors which are unique to this particular program?

Such information can help capture the differences among programs, identify specifics relative to a particular program, and illuminate the interaction of factors affecting students' education. Drawing these conclusions about individual programs and combinations of programs requires thoughtful interpretation of data.

An Approach for Evaluation of At-Risk Programs

The following pages describe an evaluation process which is adapted for at-risk programs. This approach focuses on important questions about a program; the responses to these questions will provide input for decisions about program refinement as well as the required accountability to the State. This approach offers flexibility for various types of at-risk programs and emphasizes ongoing evaluation and the use of available data, including longitudinal data.

The following steps are intended for use in developing an initial evaluation plan as well as refining an existing evaluation design for an at-risk program.

Preliminary Step. Identify and involve an Evaluation Task Group.

Multiple perspectives about a program can add variety and depth to an evaluation effort. Additionally, this can build interest and ownership in the evaluation results and protect against a too-narrow or biased assessment.

An Evaluation Task Group is comprised of 3-7 people who want and will use information about this program and can be involved throughout the program planning, implementation, and evaluation process. These individuals can be found by answering questions, such as who has questions to be answered? Who will act based upon this information? Who will devote time and share responsibility for this evaluation? This group will likely include administrators, teachers, and pupil support personnel (such as counselors), and, in some cases, may also involve parents, students and community members. It is likely to be a subset of the at-risk program's broad-based planning group.

Step 1. What are the needs this program is designed to address?

State the need for the program. In designing the program, specify who is considered "at-risk." What needs of this population are to be addressed in this program? What opportunities or problems are associated with meeting these needs? How will these impact this program plan?

This can be often be stated in a brief paragraph which begins: "This program is designed to meet what needs of what students in what setting or context."

Step 2. What are the specific goals of this program?

Clarify the program's long-range goals and specific measurable objectives. Involve the Evaluation Task Group in writing down the general goals to be addressed by the major components of the program. What are the intentions of this program? Give a clear picture of this program's specific purposes.

What indicators will signal that these intentions have been met? State each goal in specifically measurable terms based on these intentions and indicators. Focus on goals which are attainable in the short or long term, but avoid highly idealistic goals.

Identify and refine relevant evaluation questions. This is an important part of evaluation planning. This step will determine the specific information to be gathered. By identifying the important questions to be answered about a program, evaluation begins with a clear focus and the potential efficiency and effectiveness of the process is increased.

Again, involve the Evaluation Task Group in discussions. Look at the long range goals and specific measurable objectives stated for this program. Consider these significant questions.

- What questions need to be asked to know if the program's specific measurable objectives are met?
- What are the anticipated outcomes of this program?
- What do these questions imply about learners' needs, program content and delivery, available resources, or pupil progress?

Using the discussion generated by these questions, briefly address the following statement: "In order to know if (this specific objective) is met, we need to know ----------." For example, "in order to know if students identified as "at-risk" are academically successful in school, we need to know how many of these students have average or above average report card grades and test scores."

Step 3. How can this program be examined fairly?

Develop an evaluation blueprint appropriate to this program. How can you obtain information to address the issues raised in Step 2 relative to this specific program? Outline an evaluation plan which will include the following information:

- questions to be asked;
- evaluation methodology to be used;
- data to be gathered;
- who is responsible; and
- the timeline.

According to the Administrative Guidelines provided for this program by the Indiana Department of Education, program evaluation is necessarily tied to the specific measurable objectives of the program. These guidelines further encourage that a measure of academic progress be included as part of the evaluation data whenever possible. Inclusion of qualitative measures (e.g., teacher and parent reports, case studies) and other quantitative measures (e.g., attendance, self-concept scales) can be used as appropriate.

Select evaluation methods and instruments. The methodology and instruments used for evaluation must be appropriate to the program being reviewed and the information desired. The information in Appendix A may be useful in considering methodology options, evaluation strategies, and data sources for different types of Indiana at-risk programs.

Try to use more than one measure or index to address the major questions in the evaluation plan. These multiple information sources can potentially build a pattern across data and answer the question with assurance. This triangulation of data makes a more powerful statement about what was learned than a single source could. For example, survey results combined with students' academic performance and school attendance records together would draw a fuller picture of a program's impact than only one of these sources alone.

Decide what will be done, by whom, and when. Adequate pre-planning of data collection and analysis can be an important factor in discriminating good program evaluations from poorer ones. Develop a systematic plan for data collection. Use available information where possible rather than generate new data. Examples of commonly available data include Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA) data, district achievement test scores, student grades, and school records such as attendance and discipline reports. In addition to existing information it may be necessary to generate information (e.g., questionnaires, interviews) to respond to specific questions about the program.

Plan to do what is relevant and feasible. Request only necessary information, but include different types of information which might be useful in examining the at-risk program. For example, data on the following topics might be important:

1. students' needs;
2. program operation data (e.g., number of students and staff, funds expended, student profile data);
3. the program plan of action; and/or
4. outcomes and impacts.

Review data in a continuous manner. An ongoing review of data provides a way to stay informed about how a program is operating, what is working well, and what needs adjustment. This review can come from available data (e.g., students' grades and attendance records), generated data (e.g., surveys at the end of each grading period), or continuously collected data (e.g., a portfolio of student work).

Artifacts can be part of this reflection of a program. These could include letters, memoranda, copies of agenda, inservice handouts, or anecdotal records. Such artifacts collectively can provide a picture of a program's operation. It becomes possible to review the timeline, amount and clarity of communication, and important issues or emphases addressed through the program.

Continuously collected data are helpful in providing information about what is currently taking place as compared to summative data which provides the "after the fact" picture at the end of the school year. These data allow for informed decision-making during program operation and can increase the effectiveness of a program. They can also be useful for interim and final evaluation reports.

Ongoing data collection is facilitated by preplanning what data will be collected and how that collection can most easily occur. For example, a file folder system can be established and a copy of designated artifacts routinely filed during the program. A timeline can be set up for reviewing these data, e.g., a brief summary and analysis of activities and outcomes to date might be written at the end of each grading period.

Preplan how data will be analyzed. This important but sometimes neglected step can save time, trouble and frustration in program evaluation. Through formulation of a specific plan for summarizing and analyzing data, you can double-check that

(a) all the necessary information is being collected, and
(b) the evaluation plan "holds together" to give a cohesive picture of the program and to provide the necessary data to answer the questions posed in the evaluation.

This step helps to ensure that the data collected will provide a fair and complete picture of the program and that the evaluation process will be efficient, feasible and practical.

Step 4. What is happening/has happened as a result of this program?

Implement the evaluation blueprint. Systematically gather the data needed for completing the evaluation plan. To the extent possible, collect data in an on-going manner rather than at the end of the project. This allows for periodic reviews of program implementation and refinements throughout the program (i.e., formative evaluation) rather then making all decisions based on summative data.

Emphasize efficiency and accuracy in the data collection process. Develop record-keeping procedures with these ideas in mind.

Build in interim checkpoints. Formative uses of evaluation data are more likely to occur if interim checkpoints are build into the program timeline. These checkpoints might coincide with the grading periods of the school term or with the end of each semester.

At these times any data collected would be summarized and reviewed. Key audiences for the program (e.g., administrators, staff, students, parents) might share their perspective of what is working well and what needs to work better to ensure maximum impact from program efforts. The quantitative and qualitative data are considered in combination, looking for patterns of program strengths and weaknesses. Adjustments which seem warranted are made to the program at the time of the review.

Step 5. What do these data tell us about this program?

Summarize the data. At the interim or end-of-the-year checkpoint, the information collected is compiled in an easily readable format. What facts can be stated from the data? What informed opinions emerged from this process? Charts and tables often allow for concise displays of numerical data. Categorizing narrative data by topics or issues can make analysis easier.

Analyze and interpret the data. Involve the Evaluation Task Group in reviewing the data to answer the questions posed in the evaluation plan and to make judgments about the current program. Ensure that adequate information is available to answer two important questions:

1. Has this program been sufficiently examined?
2. Is this a fair evaluation of the program?

Be ready to address important questions. In addition to answering the specific questions posed in the evaluation plan, the following general questions/statements can guide the analysis of results.

1. Look for matches between what was anticipated, what was desired, and what has occurred in the program.
2. Look for discrepancies between what was anticipated, what was desired, and what has occurred in the program.
3. What unanticipated results were found?
4. Has this program been implemented as designed? What changes or refinements occurred during implementation?
5. What key issues emerged over the course of implementation and evaluation?
6. What input variables affected these output data?
7. How does this program fit in the total picture of needs and services in this district?
8. Has this program made a difference? What evidence supports this conclusion?
9. Based on these data, what decision options seem reasonable?

Step 6. What recommendations and reports can be made?

Prepare a draft report which fairly presents the program reviewed. This report will identify the strengths and weaknesses of the program so that any future programs can build on those strengths and address the problems. This report will tell what program in what context serving what kind of students produced what results. Issues such as staff satisfaction, client satisfaction (e.g., students, parents), and program success to date are addressed.

Make recommendations appropriate to the results. One purpose of evaluation is to help educators derive better practice in the future as a result of examining current practices. What judgments can be made about this program? What statements can be generally made for

similar programs? What statements are specific to the context in which this program operates? All conclusions and recommendations should be explicitly justified. Maintain a holistic view when making suggestions: how does this program fit as part of the total school picture?

Adapt the report to focus on intended audiences. It is unlikely that a single evaluation report will serve the needs of all interested audiences. By identifying the audience and its interests first, the report can be tailored to answer the questions of specific groups in appropriate language and format. After considering the data, what advice does the Evaluation Task Group have for the decision-makers of this program? What results are important to the program staff? To the program clients and community?

Brevity and clarity in reporting are virtues. A report should be no longer than is necessary to show the logical relationships across the information being presented. Proofread and "de-jargonize" each report before dissemination.

Submit the required report to the Indiana Department of Education. The report outline in Appendix B may be useful in completing this report.

Share the adapted reports with interested audiences in the school corporation.

APPENDIX A:

EVALUATION STRATEGIES and OPTIONS

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION STRATEGIES

These strategies use evaluation data to measure progress toward a program's objectives, identify issues and concerns in a program, and review decisions relevant to the operation of an effective program.

Formative Evaluation: By definition, "formative" pertains to growth or development; formative evaluation is information which is used to shape and modify a program while that program is operating and to help develop the best program possible within the available resources. Relevant data are collected in an ongoing manner and reviewed periodically to check progress toward the program's goals. Adjustments to the program are then made in an informed manner on an "as needed" basis.

Formative evaluation data are commonly obtained from surveys, interviews, and observations of the program. Ongoing collection of records (e.g., grades) and program materials (e.g., handouts for an inservice workshop) are also helpful.

Summative Evaluation: This is information which is summarized at the end of program operation (or the end of a school year) to review a full picture of the program. Data related to the program's purposes, operation, resources, and outcomes are gathered and analyzed to determine the facts about the program and make judgments after considering those data.

Summative evaluation data are commonly obtained from standardized test results and other outcome-oriented data. However, useful information can be obtained from a variety of sources as well as from summarizing data collected for formative evaluation purposes.

EVALUATION OPTIONS

The evaluation options described on the following pages were suggested by the partnership schools' proposed evaluation plans for 1988-89 at-risk programs as part of their proposals submitted to the Indiana Department of Education. The descriptions of these options and the matrix showing at-risk program components using them are provided as an overview of the broad and flexible possibilities for evaluating at-risk programs.

EVALUATION OPTIONS

Testing Measures: Schools frequently use tests to measure students' progress or achievement levels as impacted by an intervention program. A commonly used design involves tests to measure change over time by comparing the results of a test given near the beginning of the program (pretest) to results from a test given near the end of the program (posttest). Tests are also used in a posttest-only design to determine students' achievement levels at the conclusion of a program. A variety of tests can be used for these purposes, including standardized norm-referenced tests (e.g., ISTEP/CAT), criterion-referenced tests, and diagnostic tests.

When using tests of any type, it is important to pay attention to test validity and reliability. To ensure valid results, make sure there is a close match between what is being measured (e.g., general school achievement, reading proficiency) and the test instrument being used. Test reliability can be assured in two ways: (1) use well-constructed tests which have an adequate number of high quality test items; and (2) administer the tests carefully in a controlled testing environment.

Tests must be scored accurately and test results handled in a statistically sound manner. For example, compute averages from even-interval scores (e.g., NCEs; stanines), never from percentiles or grade equivalents; include only students with both a pretest and a posttest before calculating averages and determining pretest/posttest differences.

Surveys: Questionnaires or surveys provide a way to sample the opinions of important audiences (e.g., students, parents, staff). Quality surveys ask questions relevant to the program and are constructed with the following criteria in mind:

1. clarity of survey items is essential;
2. anonymity of persons responding is often desirable;
3. short items are more easily answered than long or complicated questions; and
4. biased or leading questions are to be avoided.

Surveys should be as short as possible, but of adequate length to gather the necessary information. Questions should be organized in a logical sequence. While closed-response items (e.g., multiple choice, yes/no) are more easily summarized and analyzed than open-ended items, the inclusion of one or more open-ended items can often provide unanticipated and insightful data.

Survey data can be collected at several points during the year or across several years for use in both formative and longitudinal evaluation. In such surveys, it is desirable to use the same questions and format each time the survey is administered.

Interviews: Interviews are formal meetings or conversations conducted to obtain information. They have the advantages of human interaction and flexibility, but must be carefully conducted to avoid subjectivity and possible bias. Preplan an interview by structuring several questions which are important to your focus, but allow probing of responses, where necessary, to ensure clear and complete answers. The interviewer is encouraged to approach the interview on a "person-to-person" basis, not as an expert or authority figure.

Observations: Observations are structured studies in a classroom or program which involve a record of what is happening. Before beginning, it is necessary to define what will be observed in the setting and how observations will be recorded. Data should be gathered over several observations to ensure that what is observed fairly represents the program.

A form for recording observations is needed in order to gather data systematically across the several visits. Forms are easiest to use when at least some data can be recorded in well-defined categories (e.g., frequency counts on the types of teacher-student interactions). Avoid having the observer make undocumented inferences about what happened during an observation; instead record details and explicit examples in the report as necessary background for any inferential or evaluative statements made during an observation.

Behavior/Attitude Scales: Behavior and attitude scales measure individual's feelings or beliefs about his/her self, certain behaviors, groups, or institutions. Most often these instruments are self-reports (i.e., the person reports his/her own attitudes); as such, there is no certainty whether the data reflect true attitudes, temporary moods or feelings, or even the individual's attitude toward completing the questions being asked. It is recommended that such data be used in combination with other information to provide a balanced picture of a program's impact.

In selecting a behavior/attitude scale, it is important to carefully match the instrument to what is being measured. The predictive power of a behavior/attitude scale is increased if a specific behavior (e.g., the likelihood of dropping out of school) is measured by a survey directly linked to that behavior (e.g., attitude toward school.)

The names and sources of behavior/attitude scales which might be appropriate for school uses can be found in: Measures for Psychological Assessment (check a university or public library for this book); and Test Collection Bibliographies (Attitudes and Interests), published by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ. These publications also provide specifics about each instrument's reliability and validity.

Records Examination: Making use of available records to obtain information about a program and its students can be an efficient way to gather data. A variety of records which are relevant to a program's operation and impact are often accessible in schools. These include:

- school accreditation plans and reports;
- demographic information about at-risk students (e.g., age, grade in school, current family status);
- attendance;
- grades;
- extracurricular activities; and
- information on permanent record cards (e.g., achievement test scores).

Making use of available information is facilitated by preplanning data collection. When possible, use computer assistance to access this information. When gathering data by hand, try to coincide collection with the natural occurrence of the data (e.g., gather grades as they are being recorded at the end of a grading period rather than hand-searching permanent record cards at a later date.)

Collection of Artifacts and Documentation: Artifacts are objects or pieces of information which help describe or tell the history of a program. Documentation is evidence of events or actions which occurred as part of the program. A collection of a program's artifacts and documentation of the program's progress can provide valuable evaluation data.

A wide variety of data can be considered as artifacts or documentation for a program. These include letters, memoranda, copies of meeting agenda, inservice handouts, or logs of attendance/participation in the program's activities. Samples of materials used in the program or work produced by students can sometimes be used as representative artifacts. Anecdotal records can also be evaluation data when these written records of staff's observations describe incidents related to typical behavior of students as indicators of progress/lack of progress toward the program's goals.

Artifacts and documentation should be gathered in a systematic manner to draw a meaningful picture for someone reviewing these data. The objective is quality of information, not quantity, when using this method. Care should be taken to collect "representative" information in an unbiased manner, thus ensuring an accurate description of the program from these data.

APPENDIX B:

AT-RISK EVALUATION REPORT FORM

for the INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

At-Risk Evaluation Report for the Indiana Department of Education

Complete a separate evaluation report for each at-risk program implemented by the school corporation.

School Corporation Name: _____

Mailing Address: _____

_____

Corporation number: ___ ___ ___ ___ Phone number: (_____) _____

At-Risk Program Contact Person _____

Person completing the evaluation report: _____

Person's position/title:_____ Phone: (_____)_____

PROGRAM INFORMATION

1. Title of at-risk program: _____
2. Type of at-risk program (e.g., preschool, remediation) _____
3. Grade levels served: _____ 4. (a) Total number of students served: _____

4. (b) Of the students served, give the number: _____ _____
Identified as "at-risk" Other students served

5. Specific criteria used to select students: (*Attach copies of selection forms, if used*)

6. Number and type of staff in the program:

____ Certified teachers ____ Instructional paraprofessionals

____ Student support staff -- professional (e.g., counselor; social worker)

____ Student support staff -- paraprofessional

____ Other at-risk program staff (specify: _____)

7. Total funds expended in this project: $_____ $_____ $_____
At-risk funds Local funds Other funds

8. Provide a brief description of the services provided through this at-risk program.

EVALUATION PROCESS

9. Complete the following information about this program:

Long-range Goals	Specific Measurable Objectives

10. What questions (related to the objectives) were the focus of the evaluation process?

11. What procedures were used to determine whether program methods and materials were effective? Be specific.

12. Indicate (x) persons involved in reviewing this program and the type of input they provided:

Personnel	Type of input (e.g., survey, interviews, tests)
___ administrators	_____
___ at-risk program staff	_____
___ classroom teachers	_____
___ parents of participants	_____
___ participating students	_____
___ other (specify:_____)	_____

EVALUATION RESULTS

13. Briefly list *specific outcomes* relevant to the specific measurable objectives of this program.

SUMMARY and RECOMMENDATIONS

14. Based on the evaluation results, what are the strengths of the current program? ***(Be specific.)***

15. Based on the evaluation results, what are the limitations or weaknesses of the current program? ***(Be specific.)***

16. Based on the evaluation results, what are recommendations for program refinement/enhancement? ***(Be specific.)***